

REMARKS

The final office action of August 25, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 14-21 remain pending. Claims 1-13 and 22-26 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 14 has been amended to clarify the claim. No new matter is added. Support for the amendment to claim 14 may be found in the application as originally filed.

Telephone Interview with Examiner of August 31, 2007

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time for the discussion of the present application on August 31, 2007. While no agreement was reached, the above amendments are presented to address the issues raised in the interview.

Rejection of Claims Over JOT article

Claims 14 and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the NPL document titled "JOT – A Specification for an Ink Storage and Interchange Format" (hereinafter "JOT"). Applicants traverse.

Claim 14 recites:

“ a fourth portion having the tag data, the tag data including an identifier means for referencing a first global unique identifier in the table associated with a first property of the handwritten ink information and a second global unique identifier associated with a second property of the handwritten ink information,

wherein the first property of the handwritten ink information associated with the first global unique identifier in the table is applied to the tag data and to the first stroke based on the referencing and wherein the second property of the handwritten ink information associated with the second global unique identifier in

the table is applied to the tag data and to the second stroke based on the referencing.”

The Examiner relies on JOT to reject this claim. However, JOT does not relate to a data structure. Rather, JOT relates to a specification describing how developers are to write code for ink-related applications. JOT defines variables to make the programming of applications easier for the developer during pre-compiling development of software code. JOT does not disclose any format for the data structure akin to that of the claimed data structure.

The Examiner relies on various sections of JOT when rejecting claim 14. Specifically, the Examiner relies on the ‘#define’ variables from pages 25 and 31 to disclose the identifier means as claimed. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion that these sections of JOT relate to a table and identifier means as set forth in claim 14, these sections describe the coding technique of using established names as shorthand during the application writing process. When the application is compiled, the variables are replaced with the defined values in the compiled code. For example, referring to the definitions of color variables on page 32 (e.g., #define InkColorWhite (0xFF,0xFF,0xFF,0xFF)), these variables are used to make coding of applications easier. Instead of having to reiterate the precise the color (and having to remember exactly what color value it is) in the body of the application, the developer can write InkColorWhite. Later, when the code is compiled, every occurrence of InkColorWhite is replaced with the full length (0xFF,0xFF,0xFF,0xFF) value.

For reference, Applicants attach pages 238-240 from “The Complete Reference: C++” as relating to how ‘#define’ definitions are used during the pre-compilation coding process.

In short, the sections relied upon by the Examiner do not relate to a data structure as set forth in claim 14.

To further prosecution, Applicants amend claim 14 to recite two strokes and the reference to the property. Applicants submit claim 14 is allowable over JOT.

Dependent claims 16-21 are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JOT.

Application No.: 09/852,799
Amendment dated: September 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: August 25, 2006

As stated above, JOT fails to teach or suggest the features of the independent claim. Dependent claim 15 is allowable at least as being dependent on claim 14.

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/
Christopher R. Glembocki
Reg. No. 38,800

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

Dated: September 4, 2007